REMARKS

In the July 22, 2005 Final Office Action, the Examiner:

1. Rejected claims 1-6, 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Fushie (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,197) in view of Jones (U.S. Patent No. 6,069,443);
2. Rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Fushie (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,197) in view of Manabe (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,639);
3. Rejected claims 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Fushie (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,197) in view of Jones, Stevens (U.S. Patent No. 6,239,356) and further in view of Nakazawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,349).

Applicants have canceled claim 7 without prejudice.

Applicants have amended Claim 13 to correct a typographical error. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness. The Examiner has not shown where in any of the references, there is a teaching or suggestion that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to make the combinations asserted by the Examiner.

With respect to the asserted combination of Fushie with Jones, the Examiner has not shown any teaching in either Fushie or Jones that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fushie with Jones to arrive at the claimed invention. Fushie discloses a multi-layered printered wiring board having a photosensitive glass with through-holes. Multiple wiring layers are formed on either side of the glass board. Nowhere in Fushie is there any teaching or suggestion that Fushie may be used in a display apparatus with a display element on the the sealing side surface.

Jones teaches an organic light emitting device (OLED) having a substrate and a conductor formed on the substrate. Jones teaches using a passivation layer 19 to provide a moisture barrier to individual "OLED layers 18 to provide a low pinhole density moisture barrier. The passivation layer 19 in connection with the first insulation layer 13 and electrode element 11 encapsulates the OLED layer 18 to isolate the OLED layer 18

so that the OLED layer 18 only contacts the electrode element 11 in the pixel area 14." *See* Jones 6:32-38, Figure 3. Accordingly, Jones does not teach "a sealed side surface" as recited in the claims.

The Examiner states that

> "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have included a sealed side surface and an exposed side surface, as well as, to connect the conductive patterns to a display element as taught by Jones et al in the display device as taught by Fushie et al for the purpose of providing a low pinhole density moisture barrier, as well as, to electrically connect the display element to the substrate (see Jones et al column 8, lines 1-65)." July 22 Office Action, pg. 3.

First, Fushie does not teach a display device. Fushie teaches a multi-layered printed wiring board.

Second, the Examiner does not explain how the combination of Fushie and Jones provides "a low pinhole density moisture barrier." Jones teaches the a low pinhole density moisture barrier and how to achieve it. *See* Jones 6:32-38, Figure 3. The Examiner does not explain the effect of the combination with Fushie. Similarly, Jones teaches how the display element is electrically connected to the substrate. The Examiner provides no explanation as to how Fushie is remotely relevant, particularly in the context of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has resorted to impermissible hindsight analysis in combining Fushie with Jones. The asserted combination is relevant to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-20. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 and 8-20 are allowable.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 21, 2005 By: _____

Enrique Perez
Registration No. 43,853
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000

14460196\V-4 10/21/2005